

United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Montana State Office
5001 Southgate Drive, P.O. Box 36800
Billings, Montana 59107-6800

<http://www.mt.blm.gov/>

In Reply To:
2100 (924.5) P

March 4, 2003

EMAIL TRANSMISSION - 3/4/03
Instruction Memorandum No. MT-2003-027
Expires: 9/30/04

To: Field Managers

From: Deputy State Director, Division of Resources

Subject: Request for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005 Land and Water Conservation Fund
(LWCF) Project Submissions DD: 05/15/2003

This memorandum transmits WO IM No. 2003-093 for submission of FY 2005 LWCF project proposals. It also provides a summary of the specifications for package submission and instruction to submit requests to MT-924 by May 15, 2003, for review, ranking, and packaging.

Please note that all portions of the package submission (Narrative, Factsheet, Departmental LWCF Ranking Criteria, and maps) must be submitted electronically.

Specifications for Package Submission.

Field offices should follow the program guidance and use the submission formats identified in the subject WO IM to prepare the request(s). Remember, proposals should be compelling and should clearly explain to external and internal parties why the acquisition is essential, consequences if the property is not acquired, how funds will be leveraged, and the identity of partners and others who support the project. The proposal must identify which approved land use plan the project is in compliance with and the acquisition being supported by the plan. Also, to comply with the Departmental "Best Practices in Land Acquisition" guidelines, the submission should address: 1) Any initial "start up" operations and maintenance (O&M) costs associated with the identified parcels; 2) subsequent annual O&M costs (or savings) associated with maintaining the identified parcels; and 3) the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance measure to be met with the proposed purchase.

IMPORTANT: Documents must be prepared in Microsoft Word using the attached formats exactly as shown and submitted in portrait format. New map standards apply and maps will be submitted as Adobe Acrobat Files.

MT-924 Review, Ranking, and Packaging.

Please submit (electronically) your completed project proposals to Craig Haynes (MT-924), by May 15, 2003.

As we have done in past years, a team will be assembled to assist Craig in the review, ranking, and packaging of the field office submissions since each state is limited to five submissions for FY 2005. We will then forward Montana's submissions, in priority order, to WO-350 for Bureauwide consideration and ranking.

Please contact Craig at 406-896-5040 if you have any questions or need some assistance.

Signed by: Howard A. Lemm, Acting Deputy State Director, Div. of Resources

Authenticated by: Kathy Iszler, Staff Assistant (MT-924)

1 Attachment (not including maps)
1-WO IM No. 2003-093 (14 pp)

Distribution w/Attm.

Assistant Field Manager, Havre Field Station - 1
Assistant Field Manager, Glasgow Field Station - 1
SOMT - 1

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20240

February 26, 2003

In Reply Refer To:
2100 (350) P

EMS TRANSMISSION 03/03/2003
Instruction Memorandum No. 2003-093
Expires: 09/30/2004

To: State Directors

From: Assistant Director, Minerals, Realty and Resource Protection

Subject: Fiscal Year (FY) 2005 Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF)
Project Submissions DD: 05/30/2003

In anticipation of developing the FY2005 Strategic Budget Plan (SBP), we request your submission of FY2005 LWCF project proposals. Program guidance and submission formats are attached. This request is being forwarded in advance of the formal Bureauwide SBP packet to ensure you have adequate time to prepare quality submissions. This will also allow the Bureau to prepare the best possible presentation to the Department in the timeframe requested.

Your LWCF request for FY2005 is limited to five submissions. Proposals should be compelling and should clearly explain to external and internal parties why the purchase is essential, consequences if the property is not purchased, how funds will be leveraged and the identity of partners and others who support the project. The proposal must identify which approved land use plan the project is in compliance with. As in recent years, FY2005 project narratives should note completed and pending acquisitions through donation, purchase, and exchange, whether completed by the agency or "leveraged" by a project supporter. Accompanying maps should illustrate all project acquisition accomplishments.

In order to comply with Departmental "Best Practices in Land Acquisition" guidelines, FY2005 project requests will include; 1) any initial "start-up" operations and maintenance (O&M) costs associated with parcels identified for FY2005 purchase, 2) subsequent annual O&M costs (or savings) associated with maintaining parcels identified for FY2005 purchase, and 3) the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) performance measure to be met with the proposed purchase.

As initiated in FY2004, FY2005 LWCF proposals must be submitted electronically.

Please prepare your submission, as outlined in the attached guidelines, and forward electronically to David Beaver, LWCF Program Lead, Washington Office (WO), Lands and Realty Group WO-350. Please provide a copy of your electronic submission to your State Budget Office. An interdisciplinary "National Review Team", consisting of headquarters and field personnel, will nationally prioritize FY2005 projects in July for the Director's review and approval. Electronic

submissions should be sent via email directly to David Beaver, WO-350, or posted to an “ftp” site with an email reference. Your submission must be received by Friday, May 30, 2003.

If you require additional information, have submission questions, desire submission samples, or wish the WO to preview your submission, please contact David Beaver by email or by telephone at (202) 452-7788.

Signed by:
John W. Broderick
Acting, Assistant Director
Minerals, Realty and Resource Protection

Authenticated by:
Robert M. Williams
Policy and Records Group, WO-560

4 Attachments

- 1 – Land and Water Conservation Fund FY2005 (9 pp)
- 2 – FY2004 Otay Mountain/Kuchamaa HCP Sample Narrative/Map (3 pp)
- 3 – FY2004 Sandy River/Oregon NHT Sample Narrative/Map (4 pp)
- 4 – FY2004 Sears Point ACEC/Juan Bautista de Anza NHT Sample Narrative/Map (3 pp)

Land and Water Conservation Fund FY2005

I. Program Guidance

- Land acquisition project priorities will be determined using the attached ranking criteria. State Office (SO) Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Program Leads will verify and carefully review individual and collective point totals for accuracy. Each SO Program Leads will prepare a return transmittal memo for the State Director's signature to WO-350 (forwarded electronically).
- The LWCF Act is a funding authority only, not a purchase authority. All proposed purchases must be in accordance with existing authority and approved land use plans.
- Emphasis will be placed on completing existing projects, on projects utilizing multiple acquisition methods (including exchange and donation), and on the contribution of leveraged purchase and/or management funds from non-Bureau of Land Management (BLM) sources.
- No purchase can be completed until hazardous material examinations have been performed and any remediation costs approved (remediation costs are typically borne by the seller).
- Line item LWCF appropriations (3110 funds) may only be used for purchase consideration of parcels within and/or contiguous to an approved project boundary. Acquisition Management LWCF appropriations (3130 funds) may be used for costs directly related to acquisition by purchase, or costs directly associated with donation, and exchange actions, when parcels acquired by these methods are within and/or contiguous to an approved project boundary.
- Generally, LWCF project areas are multi-parcel projects. Although a single parcel may constitute the limits of a project area, a broader project boundary is more desirable. Multiple parcel projects provide greater negotiating flexibility in spending line item appropriated (3110) funds.
- Select a project name and retain it for the duration of the project.
- Land and interests in land purchased with LWCF appropriations will perpetually remain in Federal ownership.
- Concerns over erosion of tax base (via land acquisition) and "no net gain" are issues in some areas. Be sensitive to securing local support and look to alternatives to fee purchase (i.e. conservation easement) where the purchase of an easement interest would comply with BLM resource management goals, are of interest to willing sellers, and would meet the needs of the recreating public (conservation easements generally do not provide for public access).
- LWCF appropriations are one of the very few sources of funding which can be used for fee purchase of property. Therefore, it may be most appropriate to utilize "resource" accounts for purchase consideration when pursuing purchase of less than fee interest of property (i.e. access and conservation easements).
- All purchases must be voluntary unless condemnation is authorized by the legislation governing the project.
- The purchase price cannot exceed appraised fair market value without prior approval of Congress.
- LWCF appropriations cannot be used for construction on purchased lands (fee or easement).
- Lands conveyed from state government or a political subdivision thereof may only be acquired by donation or exchange (except in Arizona).
- Unobligated line item LWCF appropriations (3110 funds) will carryover and remain with the project until completion, or until the project is no longer viable. Long term, inactive carryover balances, of any amount, may be subject to reprogramming with little or no notice.

II. Submission Requirements

Written documents must be submitted in Microsoft Word. Maps must be submitted as Adobe Acrobat files. All documents must be submitted in portrait format. Use attached formats exactly.

A. Projects

There are no State cost targets or base levels of funding for the LWCF program. The recommendation of national priorities by the National Review Team to the Director and the selection of national priorities by the Director will depend on many factors, including how well projects rank in comparison with those submitted by other states. A State Director's ranking is a recommendation to the National Review Team. Final selection of national priorities may alter these priorities to reflect national goals. Each project submitted must include a completed Narrative, Fact Sheet, Departmental Ranking Sheet, and Maps. All documents will be submitted electronically.

Narrative

The one page Narrative outlines project information, including; Location, Congressional District, Purpose, Purchase Opportunities, Cooperators, Project Description, Operations and Maintenance (O&M) cost, and a Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) goal. Each Narrative includes a "Data Box" describing historic acquisition accomplishment, proposed purchase action, and pending future action. Acres listed in each field will include both fee and conservation easement interest. Descriptions should be brief and concise and not exceed the space provided. The Project Description should be written as a marketing tool. Address the acreage of the project, significant geographic features, major resource attributes (historic, recreation, scenic, wildlife, etc.), visitation, and Department of the Interior (Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service) and Department of Agriculture (Forest Service) units contiguous to and/or in close proximity. If your proposal is associated with a BLM National Landscape Conservation System (NLCS) unit, it is recommended you use the unit description (or a condensed version thereof) as guidance for the Project Description, available online at <http://www.blm.gov/nlcs>. Significant conservation-related units (including National Wildlife Refuge, National Park, and National Forest system units), as well as State and County conservation units (including parks, wildlife management areas, etc.) should be addressed. Sample FY2004 Narratives have been provided to State Office LWCF Program Leads under separate cover.

Fact Sheet

A one page Fact Sheet provides relative, supporting information at a glance. This information will be heavily utilized by the National Review Team and will supplement the resource description of the project provided by the Narrative. Descriptions should be brief, direct, and to the point.

Maps

The LWCF maps are used for a very specific purpose (including Agency, Departmental, and Congressional review). Maps will be completed for each project and reflect the acquisition goals of the proposal. An overview map will be the first of each map series. The overview map will geographically depict the project in relationship to adjacent Federal/State/County conservation features. Subsequent map(s) will focus greater detail on specific areas within the project area where current-year purchases are targeted. Land previously acquired by purchase, exchange, and/or donation will be identified as 'Completed Acquisition'. The BLM's National Science and Technology Center will contact you regarding submission of additional mapping data for customization to national standards, should your proposal be recommended as a priority by the National Review Team and selected by the Director. Questions regarding map preparation should be directed to Chris Smith, National Science and Technology Center, at (303) 236-7381.

LWCF Map Data Submittal Guidelines

- Provide core data layers (coverage file preferred over shape file) for all categories. The categories to address are Public Land Survey System (PLSS)/ownership, project boundary, hydrography, transportation, National Scenic/National Historic Trails (within or adjacent to the project area), and urban 'built-up' areas.
- The GIS data layer will include sufficient area outside the project window (see FY2004 samples).
- Ownership coverage will be prepared consistent with H-1553 Publication Standards Manual Handbook. Information regarding the categories and color palette standards can be found at the National Science and Technology Center (NSTC) website at <http://www.blm.gov/nstc>.
- The preference is for PLSS data and ownership data to reside in the same coverage. If not, ownership data should be vertically integrated with PLSS data.
- Include the name of the 100K map(s) contained within the project area.
- Include the projection information for the GIS data.
- Geographic information described in the project narrative will appear on the maps (see FY2004 samples).

Departmental Ranking Sheet

A one page Departmental Ranking Sheet will be completed for each project. Use the criteria and instructions as described on pages 6-8.

a. Acquisition Management

Emphasis continues to be placed on land exchange as the primary method of land acquisition. It is appropriate to propose an exchange utilizing Acquisition Management (3130) funds to share processing costs, when lands acquired through exchange are within a LWCF project area and/or meet the intent of the LWCF Act. Inquire about the availability of Land Exchange Equalization Payment (3120) funding from your State Office LWCF Program Lead.

The allocation of Acquisition Management (3130) funds is reviewed annually. There are no State Office “base funding” allocations in the Acquisition Management (3130) program. The annual distribution of Acquisition Management funds to State Offices is based on carry-over prior year line-item funding (all LWCF sources), reportable accomplishment for the prior year, current year line-item (3110) appropriations, the number of parcels targeted for purchase in a given fiscal year, the complexity of specific purchases, anticipated purchases with LWCF Emergency/Inholding funds, encumbered staffing levels, staffing centralization vs. decentralization of the purchase function within the geographic bounds of a State Office, and the use of funding to assist with donation and/or exchange-related costs within project areas or within areas meeting the intent of the LWCF Act. States with perpetually large and/or growing Acquisition Management carryover balances may receive a reduced allocation to encourage use of the carryover balance. WO-350 typically retains significant Acquisition Management (3130) funding in the WO for mid-year distribution.

Project Name

STATE	County	Congressional District																																							
Location	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="text-align: center;">Acquired to Date</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="width: 33%; text-align: center;">Method</th> <th style="width: 33%; text-align: center;">Acres*</th> <th style="width: 33%; text-align: center;">Cost (\$)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Purchase</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Exchange</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Donation</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Other</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr><td>Partners</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="text-align: center;">Proposed for FY2005</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Method</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Acres*</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Cost (\$)</th> </tr> <tr><td>Purchase</td><td></td><td></td></tr> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="text-align: center;"><i>Pending Future Action</i></th> </tr> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">Method</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Acres*</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Cost (\$)</th> </tr> <tr><td>Pending</td><td></td><td></td></tr> </tbody> </table>		Acquired to Date			Method	Acres*	Cost (\$)	Purchase			Exchange			Donation			Other			Partners			Proposed for FY2005			Method	Acres*	Cost (\$)	Purchase			<i>Pending Future Action</i>			Method	Acres*	Cost (\$)	Pending		
Acquired to Date																																									
Method			Acres*	Cost (\$)																																					
Purchase																																									
Exchange																																									
Donation																																									
Other																																									
Partners																																									
Proposed for FY2005																																									
Method			Acres*	Cost (\$)																																					
Purchase																																									
<i>Pending Future Action</i>																																									
Method			Acres*	Cost (\$)																																					
Pending																																									
Purpose																																									
Purchase Opportunities																																									
Cooperators																																									
Project Description																																									
O&M Cost																																									
GPRA Goal																																									

*Includes fee and conservation easement interest

Bureau of Land Management
Land and Water Conservation Fund
FY2005 Fact Sheet

Project: _____

Owner name(s)?	
Resource threat(s)?	
Name of approved Land Use Plan proposal is in compliance with? Approval date.	
Is property within an administrative/agency "special area" or is it a component of the NLCS? Name of area.	
Is the property an inholding/edgeholding?	
Proposed use of property if purchased?	
Conservation easement opportunity?	
Exchange opportunity?	
Preliminary title opinion received?	
HazMat evaluation done?	
Appraisal completed? Value?	
Resource rehabilitation/restoration costs?	
<u>Acquisition Partnership</u> Has the property been optioned and/or prepurchased by a third party for resale to a Federal partner? If "yes", name of third party. Is the purchase "leveraged"?	
<u>Management Partnership</u> Has or will the property be cooperatively managed by other Federal or non-Federal partners? Who? Type of management?	
<u>Political Support (Who? Verbal/Written?)</u> Local political support? State political support? National political support?	
Can funds be obligated in FY2005?	

Authorization

Is this purchase authorized?	Yes	No	FLPMA (and companion authority?)
Has legislation authorized a funding ceiling?	Yes	No	
If "Yes", what is the authorized funding ceiling?	\$		
How much funding has been appropriated to date <u>over</u> the ceiling?	\$		

Funding

FY2003 LWCF appropriation?	\$
FY2004 <u>President's Budget</u> LWCF request?	\$
Appropriations to date? (this or another name?)	\$
Current unobligated balance as of _____	\$
Plans to use unobligated balance _____	

Purchase Status	Tracts	Acres	Cost	Cost/Acre
Purchases completed thru FY2002				
Purchases scheduled for FY2003				
Purchases planned for FY2004				
Purchases planned for FY2005 ¹				
Parcel 1				
Parcel 2				
Parcel 3				
Remaining lands to be acquired				

¹ If multiple parcels are proposed for FY2005 purchase, please list individually (acres, cost, cost/acre)

Procedure for Compiling Federal Land Acquisition Priority List

I. Minimum requirements (must be met in all cases)

1. The property is (a) within the boundaries of an existing Federal conservation/recreation unit, if such boundaries are set by statute; or (b) contiguous with property now comprising a Federal conservation/recreation unit, if the unit's boundaries are administratively determined; or (c) the initial "building block" of a newly authorized Federal conservation/recreation unit.
2. The property presents no known health/safety/liability problems (e.g. hazardous waste contamination, unsafe structures).
3. There is no current indication of opposition from current owner(s) to Federal acquisition of the property (condemnations may be necessary in rare instances).
4. The cost of infrastructure necessary to make the property accessible, safe, and usable by the general public does not exceed 10 percent of the estimated purchase price.

II. Ranking Criteria

Each potential purchase meeting the minimum criteria is scored by summing points received from meeting one or more of the following "ranking criteria". The indicated number of points is awarded if the proposed purchase would meet the definitions of each criterion listed below. (See instructions beginning on Page 6).

Criterion	Definition	Points
1A	Prevent <i>imminent</i> (within 2-3 years) property development that is determined by the State Director to be incompatible with the affected unit's authorized purpose(s).	50
1B	Prevent short-to-medium term (within 4-8 years) property development that is determined by the State Director to be incompatible with the affected unit's authorized purpose(s).	25
2A	Provide multiple recreation opportunities and is within a county with a population of 1,000,000 or more.	80
2B	Provide multiple recreation opportunities within 100 miles of a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA).	50
2C	Provide multiple recreation opportunities between 100 and 250 miles of a MSA.	35
2D	Provide limited recreation opportunities within 100 miles of a MSA.	35
2E	Provide limited recreation opportunities between 100 and 250 miles of a MSA.	20
3A	Preserve habitat of endangered species.	40
3B	Preserve habitat of threatened species.	30
3C	Preserve a recognized type of ecological community, to promote natural diversity.	20
4	Preserve a nationally significant natural or cultural feature of a type not now represented in any Federal conservation/recreation unit.	40
5A	The principal benefit to be derived from the acquisition is its wetlands characteristics as defined in the Emergency Wetlands Act of 1986.	80
5B	The property contains wetland or riparian area that is relatively scarce or unique.	60
5C	The property contains a wetland or riparian area that while not scarce or unique nevertheless provides substantial public benefit.	40
6A	Includes existing infrastructure required to make property accessible to and usable by the general public and by elderly/physically challenged citizens.	40
6B	Includes existing infrastructure required to make property accessible to and usable by the general public, but not by elderly/physically challenged citizens.	20
7	Expands a unit with a record of visitor-day growth exceeding 5 percent per year in at least three of the five prior years.	20
8	Improves manageability and efficiency of a unit.	20

Criterion	Definition	Points
9	Results in Federal savings in acquisition costs through the use of exchange, donation, and other alternatives to the direct purchase of property at full value. Add <i>five points</i> for each estimated 20 percent savings in Federal acquisition costs up to a maximum of 25 points.	5-25
10	Involves Federal acquisition of less than full fee title to the property (e.g. purchase of conservation easements).	10
11	Involves significant non-Federal partnership. For each non-Federal partner (State, local, private) contributing significant resources (“significant” – at least 25 percent of acquisition, development, or management costs), add <i>five points</i> , up to a maximum of 15 points.	5-15

Ranking criteria listed under a single number (e.g. “1.A.”, “1.B.”) are mutually exclusive; points may not be awarded for more than one. For example, a proposed purchase may score 40 points for meeting criteria 3.A., but cannot score 70 points for meeting criteria 3.A. and 3.B. Each property proposed for purchase would normally be scored separately. However, if several related properties are proposed for purchase as a group to optimize use of funds, the group could be assigned a composite score.

III. State Director’s Priority Ranking

Each State Director should prioritize up to five (1-5) FY2005 submissions. Those states managing public lands in more than one state are permitted a total of five submissions. Requests for exceptions to this limit will be electronically submitted to and receive approval from WO-350 prior to the State Director’s priority ranking. The State Director’s ranking is a recommendation to the National Review Team and the Director, final selection of national priorities may alter these priorities to reflect national goals.

Departmental LWCF Project Ranking Criteria/Instructions

I. Minimum Requirements

1. Show type of designation under A, B, or C.
- 2-4. Check if minimal requirements are met. If met, rank the project under the following criteria.

II. Ranking Criteria

1. A or B. Show type of potential development/damage.
2. A – E. Use current census and MSA map. Show the name of the city designated as an MSA. Use the nearest boundary of the county in which the city is located in determining the distance from the project area.
3. List the threatened or endangered species (Federal List).
4. To receive points the project must be a “one-of-a-kind.” (e.g. No points are provided if the project is another wild and scenic river, historic trail, etc.). Describe the unique feature.
5. Consult the RMP for Wetland/Riparian values and review the 1986 Emergency Wetlands Act for characteristics.
6. Points are provided if the project is currently useable by either the physically challenged or the general public without improvements.
7. Use an estimate based on similar sites if specific data is not available.
8. No points are available for new projects located entirely on non-Federal land.
9. This criterion relates Federal expenditures to the fair market value of the property. For example, if almost one half of the property value (not number of tracts) can be acquired by exchange or donation (rather than purchase), 10 points would be available.
10. Points are available if any acquisition in the project is for a less than fee title interest (i.e. conservation easement).
11. Each non-Federal partner must contribute at least 25 percent of the cost in order to receive points. Identify the partner.

III. General

1. Fill out a ranking sheet for each project.
2. Only one alpha factor may be used for a single numbered criteria (ex: 2.A., not 2.A. and B.).
3. Use N/A if criteria does not apply.
4. Provide name and title of evaluator.
5. Rank projects in State priority order on bottom line of form.

<i>I. MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS</i>			
1			
A/B/C			
2			
3			
4			
<i>II. RANKING CRITERIA</i>			
	Narrative	Points Available	Points Allocated
1A		50	
1B		25	
2A		80	
2B		50	
2C		35	
2D		35	
2E		20	
3A		40	
3B		30	
3C		20	
4		40	
5A		80	
5B		60	
5C		40	
6A		40	
6B		20	
7		20	
8		20	
9		5-25	
10		10	
11		5-15	
Total Points (Items 1-11)			
<i>III. STATE DIRECTOR'S PRIORITY RANKING</i>			

Otay Mountain/Kuchamaa Habitat Conservation Plan

CALIFORNIA		San Diego County	Congressional Districts 51, 52																																								
Location	Southern California, 15 miles east of San Diego.	<table><tr><th colspan="3">Acquired to Date</th></tr><tr><th>Method</th><th>Acres</th><th>Cost (\$)</th></tr><tr><td>Purchase</td><td>3,903</td><td>10,763,120</td></tr><tr><td>Exchange</td><td>1,895</td><td>4,700,000</td></tr><tr><td>Donation</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Other</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Partners</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><th colspan="3">Proposed for FY2004</th></tr><tr><th>Method</th><th>Acres</th><th>Cost (\$)</th></tr><tr><td>Purchase</td><td>352</td><td>1,000,000</td></tr><tr><th colspan="3">Pending Future Action</th></tr><tr><th>Method</th><th>Acres</th><th>Cost (\$)</th></tr><tr><td>Pending</td><td>3,850</td><td>8,200,000</td></tr></table>			Acquired to Date			Method	Acres	Cost (\$)	Purchase	3,903	10,763,120	Exchange	1,895	4,700,000	Donation	0	0	Other	0	0	Partners	0	0	Proposed for FY2004			Method	Acres	Cost (\$)	Purchase	352	1,000,000	Pending Future Action			Method	Acres	Cost (\$)	Pending	3,850	8,200,000
Acquired to Date																																											
Method	Acres	Cost (\$)																																									
Purchase	3,903	10,763,120																																									
Exchange	1,895	4,700,000																																									
Donation	0	0																																									
Other	0	0																																									
Partners	0	0																																									
Proposed for FY2004																																											
Method	Acres	Cost (\$)																																									
Purchase	352	1,000,000																																									
Pending Future Action																																											
Method	Acres	Cost (\$)																																									
Pending	3,850	8,200,000																																									
Purpose	Protect key habitat areas and wildlife corridors within the HCP to meet Federal/State requirements of the Endangered Species Act.																																										
Purchase Opportunities	Multiple properties facing immediate threats from industrial, rural residential, and suburban development, are available.																																										
Cooperators	The Trust for Public Land, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, City and County of San Diego, San Diego Association of Governments.																																										
Project Description	<p>Representing one of the richest and most threatened regions of biodiversity in the world, the 38,000-acre Otay Mountain/Kuchamaa Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) lies immediately east of rapidly growing San Diego and north of the United States-Mexico international border. The project area overlaps the Otay National Cooperative Land and Wildlife Management Area designated in 1952, the Otay Mountain Wilderness designated in 1999 and shares a common boundary with the San Diego National Wildlife Refuge, administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.</p> <p>The rapidly diminishing coastal sage scrub ecosystem found here (only 10% of the ecosystem remains intact) is a focus of California's Natural Community Conservation Planning protection effort. The ecosystem provides habitat for the California gnatcatcher, Quino checkerspot butterfly, and several other Federally listed threatened or endangered species. Listed in the <i>Directory of Federal Natural Areas</i>, the area supports at least 15 Federal candidate or listed plant species, including the world's largest stand of Tecate cypress. An additional four plant species are only found on or near Otay Mountain. Explosive urban growth and development, and unregulated recreational activities pose an immediate threat to the remaining unprotected areas of coastal sage scrub. The Otay Mountain/Kuchamaa HCP is the largest coastal sage scrub core preserve identified by the Multiple Species Conservation Plan approved by the City and County of San Diego and the San Diego Association of Governments.</p> <p>Tecate and Little Tecate Peaks, within the HCP, provide a cultural link to the Kumeyaay people and their religious heritage.</p>																																										
O&M Cost	Estimated "start up" cost: \$10,000	Estimated "annual" maintenance: \$5,000																																									
GPRA Goal	Preserve natural and cultural heritage resources.																																										

Sandy River/Oregon National Historic Trail

OREGON		Clackamas and Multnomah Counties	Congressional Districts 3, 5																																										
Location	Northwest Oregon, 20 miles southeast of Portland.	<table><tr><th colspan="3">Acquired to Date</th></tr><tr><th>Method</th><th>Acres</th><th>Cost (\$)</th></tr><tr><td>Purchase</td><td>912</td><td>4,164,000</td></tr><tr><td>Exchange</td><td>3,548</td><td>15,761,730</td></tr><tr><td>Donation</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Other</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Partners</td><td>1,500</td><td>6,660,115</td></tr><tr><th colspan="3">Proposed for FY2004</th></tr><tr><th>Method</th><th>Acres</th><th>Cost (\$)</th></tr><tr><td>Purchase</td><td>208</td><td>1,000,000</td></tr><tr><th colspan="3">Pending Future Action</th></tr><tr><th>Method</th><th>Acres</th><th>Cost (\$)</th></tr><tr><td>Pending</td><td>1,812</td><td>7,375,000</td></tr></table>					Acquired to Date			Method	Acres	Cost (\$)	Purchase	912	4,164,000	Exchange	3,548	15,761,730	Donation	0	0	Other	0	0	Partners	1,500	6,660,115	Proposed for FY2004			Method	Acres	Cost (\$)	Purchase	208	1,000,000	Pending Future Action			Method	Acres	Cost (\$)	Pending	1,812	7,375,000
Acquired to Date																																													
Method	Acres	Cost (\$)																																											
Purchase	912	4,164,000																																											
Exchange	3,548	15,761,730																																											
Donation	0	0																																											
Other	0	0																																											
Partners	1,500	6,660,115																																											
Proposed for FY2004																																													
Method	Acres	Cost (\$)																																											
Purchase	208	1,000,000																																											
Pending Future Action																																													
Method	Acres	Cost (\$)																																											
Pending	1,812	7,375,000																																											
Purpose	Acquisition of multiple parcels within the Sandy River gorge, allowing for the protection of significant scenic, recreation, fisheries, and wildlife values.																																												
Purchase Opportunities	Multiple properties facing immediate threats from commercial and rural residential development, and degrading land use practices																																												
Cooperators	Western Rivers Conservancy, The Nature Conservancy, U.S. Forest Service, State of Oregon, Clackamas and Multnomah Counties, METRO (regional government body), Cities of Portland and Sandy, Portland General Electric (PGE), Northwest Steelheaders, Oregon Trout, Sandy River Watershed Council.																																												
Project Description	<p>A breath-taking scenic corridor immediately east of metropolitan Portland, the Sandy and Salmon River canyons descend from the forested slopes of Mount Hood, harboring a rich diversity of animal and plant populations, within secluded riparian and wetland areas. Multiple listed salmon species, including Lower Columbia Chinook and Chum salmon use these turbulent waters for spawning and rearing their young before returning to the Pacific Ocean via the Columbia River. Old growth stands of Douglas fir contain prime habitat for the threatened northern spotted owl.</p> <p>The Sandy River project offers exceptional recreational opportunities for fishing, hiking, camping, wildlife viewing, nature study, land-based recreational day use, and non-motorized boating or floating. The project is easily accessible from the Portland Metro area, the northwest's second largest population center.</p> <p>The 29,000-acre Sandy River project contains the route of the historic Barlow Road, the western segment of the Oregon National Historic Trail. The project shares a common boundary with the Salmon-Huckleberry Wilderness, administered by the U.S. Forest Service.</p> <p>BLM is working with PGE to remove the Bull Run hydroelectric project, including dams on both the Sandy and Little Sandy Rivers. Dam removal will restore the free flowing character of the Sandy River. The decommissioning includes eventual transfer of 1,272 acres of PGE lands within the Sandy River project area into Federal ownership.</p>																																												

O&M Cost	Estimated "start up" cost: \$5,000	Estimated "annual" maintenance: \$1,500
GPRA Goal	Provide opportunities for environmentally responsible recreation.	

Bureau of Land Management

Sears Point Area of Critical Environmental Concern/ Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail

ARIZONA		Yuma County	Congressional District 7																																										
Location	Southwest Arizona, 80 miles east of Yuma.	<table><tr><th colspan="3">Acquired to Date</th></tr><tr><th>Method</th><th>Acres</th><th>Cost (\$)</th></tr><tr><td>Purchase</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Exchange</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Donation</td><td>320</td><td>48,000</td></tr><tr><td>Other</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>Partners</td><td>0</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><th colspan="3">Proposed for FY2004</th></tr><tr><th>Method</th><th>Acres</th><th>Cost (\$)</th></tr><tr><td>Purchase</td><td>2,520</td><td>500,000</td></tr><tr><th colspan="3">Pending Future Action</th></tr><tr><th>Method</th><th>Acres</th><th>Cost (\$)</th></tr><tr><td>Pending</td><td>4,142</td><td>1,500,000</td></tr></table>					Acquired to Date			Method	Acres	Cost (\$)	Purchase	0	0	Exchange	0	0	Donation	320	48,000	Other	0	0	Partners	0	0	Proposed for FY2004			Method	Acres	Cost (\$)	Purchase	2,520	500,000	Pending Future Action			Method	Acres	Cost (\$)	Pending	4,142	1,500,000
Acquired to Date																																													
Method	Acres	Cost (\$)																																											
Purchase	0	0																																											
Exchange	0	0																																											
Donation	320	48,000																																											
Other	0	0																																											
Partners	0	0																																											
Proposed for FY2004																																													
Method	Acres	Cost (\$)																																											
Purchase	2,520	500,000																																											
Pending Future Action																																													
Method	Acres	Cost (\$)																																											
Pending	4,142	1,500,000																																											
Purpose	Protect significant cultural and natural resources within the boundary of Sears Point Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC).																																												
Purchase Opportunities	Multiple properties threatened with commercial use, industrial extraction, and seasonal rural residential development are available.																																												
Cooperators	The Archeological Conservancy, The Conservation Fund, The Nature Conservancy, The Trust for Public Land, Arizona Game and Fish Department, City of Yuma.																																												
Project Description	<p>For thousands of years, Native Americans and historic peoples were drawn to Sears Point, an isolated area of black mesas along the Gila River. The 3,668-acre Sears Point ACEC lies at this crossroad of historical events and cultures. It embraces a wide array of archeological sites, including rock alignments and aboriginal trails. This fragile evidence of human history spans thousands of years with some dating as far back as the Archaic Period. Numerous petroglyph panels carved by travelers at various times in history make up the core of this fascinating body of evidence. These petroglyphs attest that the Gila River has long been an important route for travel through Arizona. The Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail and the Butterfield Overland Mail Route followed the course of the Gila River as it wound its way past Sears Point.</p> <p>The Sears Point Archeological District was nominated to the National Register of Historic Places in 1985, and designated an ACEC in 1988. In addition to protecting abundant cultural resources, it also protects important natural resources, such as the nearby mesquite bosque on the Gila River floodplain. The bosque provides high-quality habitat for wildlife, including southwestern willow flycatcher migration.</p> <p>The fragile and isolated nature of the petroglyphs at Sears Point leaves them particularly vulnerable to theft and senseless acts of vandalism. Evidence of both can already be found among the irreplaceable motifs etched in rock. Native American tribal governments and the City of Yuma have expressed interest in cooperating with the Bureau of Land Management to regulate public access and provide site interpretation to conserve this world-class resource.</p>																																												

O&M Cost	Estimated "start up" cost: \$10,000	Estimated "annual" maintenance: \$5,000
----------	-------------------------------------	---

GPRA Goal	Preserve natural and cultural heritage resources.
-----------	---

Bureau of Land Management